

REMARKSPending Claims

Claims 10-15 remain pending. Claims 10-12 have been amended and claims 13-15 are withdrawn from consideration as being directed to a non-elected invention.

Drawings

As amended, Fig. 2 is consistent with the description of the figure provided in the paragraph bridging pages 8 and 9 of the specification, for example. Accordingly, entry of the amendments to Fig. 2 is respectfully requested.

35 U.S.C. §112

The specification has been objected to as not being written in a manner enabling a person skilled in the art to practice the invention. However, Applicants respectfully assert that the objection should be withdrawn in view of the changes made to Fig. 2 and for the following reasons.

With reference to Fig. 2, inspection items 1, 2, 3, 5, 7 and 8 are shown within apparatus 33 of user X. These are the inspection items that will be used by the user. Since

the automatic analyzer of the invention performs analysis by mixing a sample with a reagent in order to perform analysis of the components contained in the sample, the reagents may be supplied by different reagent manufacturers, such as those of reagent manufacturers A, B and C. Based on the detected absorbance of an analysis item, as measured by a photometer for example, as compared with that of a standard sample, the concentration is determined. In particular, the concentration is determined by using a calibration curve between the concentration and the absorbance. The calibration curve that is used to convert the detected absorbance to the concentration is an example of the reagent parameter that is set forth in the specification. When user X uses reagents manufactured by different manufacturers, the reagent parameters are stored relating to the analysis items, rather than separately related to the manufacturers. In this regard, the specification discusses storing the reagent parameters for the different reagents of different reagent manufacturers in batch form on a floppy disk 36, as shown in Fig. 2.

Claim 10 has been amended to clarify that which the Applicants regard as their invention. In particular, the

reagent setup method is claimed to be for registering reagent parameters corresponding to inspection items used in the analytical apparatus. Further, the reagent parameters are claimed as being different corresponding to reagents and plural reagent manufacturers. Accordingly, one of the steps of the reagent setup method of the present invention provides a reagent parameter set of one of the inspection items and one of the plural reagent manufacturers corresponding to specifications of the reagents by using the reagent parameters stored in a storage medium in which reagent parameters of reagents supplied by plural reagent manufacturers are stored. Accordingly, in view of the foregoing discussion, the changes to Fig. 2 and the amendments to claims 10-12, the 35 U.S.C. §112 objections to the specification and rejection of the claims should be withdrawn.

35 U.S.C. §103

Claims 10-12 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Smith et al, U.S. 2002/0143725. Reconsideration of the rejection is requested.

In particular, Smith discloses the determining of

parameters for chemical synthesis and for supplying the reagents. Reagent chemicals that are used to synthesize the target chemical are displayed in a list along with the listing of the equipment and procedures that are used to synthesize the target chemical. See Fig. 17 which shows the procedure for providing the listing described by Smith. However, the reference does not disclose storing reagent parameters of reagents supplied by plural reagent manufacturers into a storage medium as claimed by Applicants. Further, the reference does not disclose providing a reagent parameter set of one of the inspection items and one of plural reagent manufacturers corresponding to specifications of the reagents by using the reagent parameters stored in a storage medium, as claimed. Accordingly, the reference does not render the invention as claimed unpatentable under 35 U.S.C. §103(a), and therefore the rejection should be withdrawn.

Conclusion

In view of the foregoing amendments and remarks,
Applicants contend that the above-identified application is
now in condition for allowance. Accordingly,
reconsideration and reexamination is requested.

Respectfully submitted,

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to read "John R. Mattingly", written in a cursive style.

John R. Mattingly
Registration No. 30,293
Attorney for Applicant(s)

MATTINGLY, STANGER, MALUR & BRUNDIDGE, P.C.
1800 Diagonal Rd., Suite 370
Alexandria, Virginia 22314
(703) 684-1120
Date: February 4, 2005

FIG. 2

